



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,226	07/16/2007	Oliver Schmitt	LSG06322	6944
50488	7590	07/13/2010		
ALLEMAN HALL MCCOY RUSSELL & TUTTLE LLP			EXAMINER	
806 SW BROADWAY			HWANG, STAMFORD	
SUITE 600				
PORTLAND, OR 97205-3335			ART UNIT	
			PAPER NUMBER	
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			07/13/2010	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/590,226

Applicant(s)

SCHMITT ET AL.

Examiner

STAMFORD HWANG

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2010.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to Claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The examiner has withdrawn the objection to the claims and title and further withdrawn the rejection to 35 USC § 112 second paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Shaheen et al. (U.S. 7,050,800 B2) and Purkayastha et al. (U.S. 6,987,985 B2).

With respect to Claim 1, Shaheen et al. teaches a device for converting UMTS-FDD signals into WLAN signals, comprising:

- a receiver unit for receiving the UMTS-FDD signals (**Fig. 2, Format Converter 16, Col. 2, line 13 - 36**), wherein the device converts the UMTS signals received into the WLAN signals (**Fig. 2, Format Converter 16, Col. 2, line 13 - 36**); and

- means for providing or transmitting the WLAN signals (**Fig. 2, Format Converter 16, Col. 2, line 13 - 36**);

Shaheen et al. does not explicitly teach:

- wherein the device is installed at a point in a building where the UMTS-FDD signals cannot provide suitable UMTS-FDD signal coverage to an interior region of the building, and wherein at said point the UMTS-FDD signals are received by the device, and from said point the device transmits the WLAN signals to provide the interior region of the building with WLAN signal coverage.

Purkayastha et al. teaches that a mobile unit communicating or seeking to communicate with a target unit may travel to areas of poor signal quality and therefore, requiring the unit to switch to a different type of network which will maintain a communication session on an ongoing basis (**Col. 3, lines 51 - 67, Col. 4, lines 8 - 15 and Fig. 1b**).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Shaheen et al. to switch to a different type of network when coverage of a first network is deteriorates, as taught by Purkayastha et al., to avoid disconnecting ongoing communications.

With respect to Claim 5, the combination of Shaheen et al. and Purkayastha et al. teaches all of the limitations in Claim 1 as discussed above. Shaheen et al. does not teach wherein the means for providing or transmitting the WLAN signals comprises a

slot and a plug-in WLAN card to be inserted into the same, by means of which signals according to the WLAN standard are generated.

Purkayastha et al. teaches using WLAN card to enable a user to use different types of networks (**Col. 3, lines 51 - 67**).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Shaheen et al. to switch to a different type of network when coverage of a first network is deteriorates, as taught by Purkayastha et al., to avoid disconnecting ongoing communications.

Claims 2 - 4, 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Shaheen et al. (U.S. 7,050,800 B2) and Purkayastha et al. (U.S. 6,987,985 B2) as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of de Jong et al. (U.S. 7,251,227 B2).

With respect to Claim 2, the combination of Shaheen et al. and Purkayastha et al. teaches all of the limitations in Claim 1 as discussed above. The combination does not teach further comprising:

- means for converting the UMTS-FDD signals received into signals according to a telephone standard; and
- means for providing or transmitting the signals according to the telephone standard.

de Jong et al. teaches:

- means for converting the UMTS-FDD signals received into signals according to a telephone standard (**Fig. 3 and Col. 3, lines 20 - 34**); and
- means for providing or transmitting the signals according to the telephone standard (**Fig. 3 and Col. 3, lines 20 - 34**).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Shaheen et al. and Purkayastha et al. to convert UMTS signals to a telephone standard, as taught by de Jong et al., to facilitate the conversion of communication signals.

With respect to Claim 3, Shaheen et al. teaches a device comprising:

- a receiver unit for receiving the UMTS-FDD signals (**Fig. 2, Format Converter 16, Col. 2, line 13 - 36**), wherein the device converts the UMTS signals received into the signals according to the "WLAN" standard (**Fig. 2, Format Converter 16, Col. 2, line 13 - 36**); and
- means for providing or transmitting the signals according to the "WLAN" standard (**Fig. 2, Format Converter 16, Col. 2, line 13 - 36**);

Shaheen et al. does not explicitly teach:

- wherein the device is installed at a point in a building where the UMTS-FDD signals cannot provide suitable UMTS-FDD signal coverage to an interior region of the building, and wherein at said point the UMTS-FDD signals are received by the device, and from said point the device

transmits the signals according to the "WLAN" standard to provide the interior region of the building with "WLAN" standard signal coverage.

Purkayastha et al. teaches that a mobile unit communicating or seeking to communicate with a target unit may travel to areas of poor signal quality and therefore, requiring the unit to switch to a different type of network which will maintain a communication session on an ongoing basis (**Col. 3, lines 51 - 67, Col. 4, lines 8 - 15 and Fig. 1b**).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Shaheen et al. to switch to a different type of network when coverage of a first network is deteriorates, as taught by Purkayastha et al., to avoid disconnecting ongoing communications.

Shaheen et al., in view of Purkayastha et al., does not teach:

- wherein the device converts the UMTS signals received into the signals according to the telephone standard; and
- means for providing or transmitting the signals according to the telephone standard;

de Jong et al. teaches:

- wherein the device converts the UMTS signals received into the signals according to the telephone standard (**Fig. 3 and Col. 3, lines 20 - 34**); and

- means for providing or transmitting the signals according to the telephone standard (**Fig. 3 and Col. 3, lines 20 - 34**).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Shaheen et al. and Purkayastha et al. to convert UMTS signals to a telephone standard, as taught by de Jong et al., to facilitate the conversion of communication signals.

With respect to Claim 4, the combination of Shaheen et al., Purkayastha et al. and de Jong et al. teaches all of the limitations in Claim 3 as discussed above. Purkayastha et al. further teaches means for providing or transmitting the WLAN signals from said point to provide the interior region of the building with WLAN signal coverage (**Col. 3, lines 51 - 67, Col. 4, lines 8 - 15 and Fig. 1b**).

With respect to Claim 10, Shaheen et al. teaches a communication system comprising:

- a device converting Universal Mobile Telecommunication System (UMTS) signals into signals according to a "WLAN" standard, comprising: a receiver unit for receiving the UMTS-FDD signals (**Fig. 2, Format Converter 16, Col. 2, line 13 - 36**), wherein the device converts the UMTS signals received into the signals according to the "WLAN" standard (**Fig. 2, Format Converter 16, Col. 2, line 13 - 36**); and means for

providing or transmitting the signals according to the "WLAN" standard

(Fig. 2, Format Converter 16, Col. 2, line 13 - 36);

Shaheen et al. does not explicitly teach:

- wherein the device is installed at a point in a building where the UMTS-FDD signals cannot provide suitable UMTS-FDD signal coverage to an interior region of the building, and wherein at said point the UMTS-FDD signals are received by the device, and from said point the device transmits the signals according to the "WLAN" standard to provide the interior region of the building with "WLAN" standard signal coverage.
- at least one computer and/or telephone system and/or fax machine connected with the device.

Purkayastha et al. teaches that a mobile unit or laptop computers communicating or seeking to communicate with a target unit may travel to areas of poor signal quality and therefore, requiring the unit to switch to a different type of network which will maintain a communication session on an ongoing basis **(Col. 3, lines 24 - 35, Col. 3, lines 51 - 67, Col. 4, lines 8 - 15 and Fig. 1b).**

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Shaheen et al. to switch to a different type of network when coverage of a first network is deteriorates, as taught by Purkayastha et al., to avoid disconnecting ongoing communications.

Shaheen et al., in view of Purkayastha et al., does not teach:

- wherein the device converts the UMTS signals received into the signals according to the telephone standard; and
- means for providing or transmitting the signals according to the telephone standard;

de Jong et al. teaches:

- wherein the device converts the UMTS signals received into the signals according to the telephone standard (Fig. 3 and Col. 3, lines 20 - 34); and
- means for providing or transmitting the signals according to the telephone standard (Fig. 3 and Col. 3, lines 20 - 34).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Shaheen et al. and Purkayastha et al. to convert UMTS signals to a telephone standard, as taught by de Jong et al., to facilitate the conversion of communication signals.

With respect to Claim 14, the combination of Shaheen et al., Purkayastha et al. and de Jong et al. teaches all of the limitations in Claim 10 as discussed above. Shaheen et al. does not teach wherein the means for providing or transmitting the WLAN signals comprises a slot and a plug-in WLAN card to be inserted into the same, by means of which signals according to the WLAN standard are generated.

Purkayastha et al. teaches using WLAN card to enable a user to use different types of networks (Col. 3, lines 51 - 67).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Shaheen et al., Purkayastha et al. and de Jong et al. to switch to a different type of network when coverage of a first network is deteriorates, as taught by Purkayastha et al., to avoid disconnecting ongoing communications.

Claims 6 and 11 - 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaheen et al. (U.S. 7,050,800 B2), Purkayastha et al. (U.S. 6,987,985 B2) and de Jong et al. (U.S. 7,251,227 B2) as applied to Claim 3 above, and further in view of Pitsoulakis (U.S. 2003/0035471 A1).

With respect to Claim 6, the combination of Shaheen et al., Purkayastha et al. and de Jong et al. teaches all of the limitations in Claim 3 as discussed above. The combination does not teach wherein the means for providing or transmitting signals according to the telephone standard comprises a connecting unit for a telephone system or a fax machine.

Pitsoulakis teaches a connecting unit for a telephone system or a fax machine **(Fig. 1, Network 106 and Paragraph [0031])**.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the device in Shaheen et al., Purkayastha et al. and de Jong et al. teaches to connect with a telephone system or fax machine through wire line, as taught by Pitsoulakis, to provide telephone services.

With respect to Claim 11, the combination of Shaheen et al., Purkayastha et al. and de Jong et al. teaches all of the limitations in Claim 10 as discussed above. The combination does not teach wherein the at least one computer is connectable by means of the device both with each other and with the Internet.

Pitsoulakis teaches wherein the at least one computer is connectable by means of the device both with each other and with the Internet (**Fig. 5 and Paragraph [0039]**).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the device in Shaheen et al., Purkayastha et al. and de Jong et al. teaches to connect with a computer, as taught by Pitsoulakis, to allow Internet access.

With respect to Claim 12, the combination of Shaheen et al., Purkayastha et al. and de Jong et al. teaches all of the limitations in Claim 10 as discussed above. The combination does not teach wherein the at least one telephone system or fax machine communicates with the device via a cord-connected line.

Pitsoulakis teaches wherein the at least one telephone system or fax machine communicates with the device via a cord-connected line (**Fig. 1, Network 106 and Paragraph [0031]**).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the device in Shaheen et al., Purkayastha et al. and de Jong et al. teaches to connect with a telephone system or fax machine through wire line, as taught by Pitsoulakis, to provide telephone services.

With respect to Claim 13, the combination of Shaheen et al., Purkayastha et al. and de Jong et al. teaches all of the limitations in Claim 10 as discussed above. The combination does not teach wherein the device communicates with a transceiver unit for telephone or fax data and the transceiver unit has a cordless connection with the telephone system or the fax machine.

Pitsoulakis teaches wherein the device communicates with a transceiver unit for telephone or fax data and the transceiver unit has a cordless connection with the telephone system or the fax machine (**Paragraph [0044] and Table 5**).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the device in Shaheen et al., Purkayastha et al. and de Jong et al. teaches to connect with a telephone system or fax machine cordlessly, as taught by Pitsoulakis, to provide convenient telephone services.

Claims 7, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaheen et al. (U.S. 7,050,800 B2) and Purkayastha et al. (U.S. 6,987,985 B2) as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Lewis et al. (U.S. 6,956,846 B2).

With respect to Claims 7, 8 and 9, the combination of Shaheen et al. and Purkayastha et al. teaches all of the limitations in Claim 1 as discussed above. The combination does not teach wherein the UMTS-FDD signals comprise Internet data, voice data or fax messages.

Lewis et al. teaches wherein the UMTS-FDD signals comprise Internet data and voice data (**Col. 2, line 15 - 30**).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have Internet and voice data transmitted through UMTS signals to allow successful communication between two communicating devices.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **STAMFORD HWANG** whose telephone number is

(571)270-5578. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday ~ Friday 9:00AM ET~ 6:00PM ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on (571)272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S.H./

/Charles N. Appiah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617